

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO**

**STANDARD QUIMICA DE VENEZUELA, et al.,
Plaintiffs,**

v.

Case Number: 96-2548 (DRD)

**CENTRAL HISPANO INTERNATIONAL, INC., et al.,
Defendants.**

ORDER

Pending before the Court are Docket #'s 132, 139, 145, 146, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161, 165, 167, 170, 171, 173, 174 and 175 . The Court rules as follows:

<u>Docket #</u>	<u>Date:</u>	<u>Ruling</u>	<u>Title</u>
132	03/20/01	DENIED / MOOT	Motion to Strike Opposition Response Regarded deposition of counsel which was subsequently withdrawn, hence now moot.
139	07/16/01	GRANTED	Motion to Compel Deposition of Plaintiff Now that Plaintiff has withdrawn Motion for Voluntary Dismissal with Prejudice (see Docket #171), the parties are to agree upon a mutually agreeable date for deposition of Co-Plaintiff Mrs. Espuny de Prieto within the next thirty (30) days.
145	08/07/01	DENIED / MOOT	Leave to File Reply Regarded opposition to Motion for Voluntary Dismissal with Prejudice; said Motion was withdrawn (see Docket #171).
146	08/10/01	DENIED / MOOT	Leave to File Reply Regarded opposition to Motion for Voluntary Dismissal with Prejudice; said Motion was withdrawn (see Docket #171).
153	09/04/01	DENIED w/out Prejudice	Motion to Compel Discovery The Plaintiffs have subsequently filed an Amended Complaint in this case (Docket # 169), which may or may not likely drastically change the scope of discovery. This Motion is Denied without prejudice to enable the parties to refocus their discovery efforts, and naturally file any related motions thereafter.
154	09/05/01	GRANTED IN PART	Motion to Amend Order The Court issued an Order on August 6, 2001, regarding Docket #'s 101,

RECEIVED AND FILED
01 NOV -1 AM 0:06
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SAN JUAN, P.R.

181 78

111 and 118, each of which were motions by the Defendants complaining of the difficulties in getting the Plaintiffs to proceed with proper discovery (Docket #143). In the Court's August 6 Order we instructed Plaintiffs to show cause why it should not be held that they have waived any / all objections (with the exception of those based on privilege) with respect to answers to interrogatories and production of documents due to their extreme tardiness in timely proceeding with discovery. Through Plaintiffs' current Motion in Compliance with Order to Show Cause and Motion to Amend Order (Docket #154), Plaintiffs explain that they in fact have been timely submitting answers to interrogatories and requests for production of documents all along. The Court is not entirely convinced by the Plaintiffs explanations, though the Court understands that at a recent Rule 311 meeting the parties have come to mutual understandings regarding most, if not all, possible objections in these areas. The Court is willing to follow the agreements of the parties in these regards, and further willing to allow any objections to continue which can be shown to have originally been raised when the particular discovery at issue was being timely submitted (each party will bear the burden of clearly establishing that the objection was raised in the original response of a *timely* submitted answer to interrogatory or production of document). The Court's August 6, 2001 Order (Docket #143) shall be amended accordingly.

- | | | |
|-----|----------|--|
| 156 | 09/05/01 | <p>GRANTED / MOOT Motion to Extend Time</p> <p>Regarding certified translations the subject of Docket # 153 above. Note that though it is possible these documents are no longer needed in light of the Docket # 153 ruling above (thus rendering the matter entirely moot), the certified translations have already been submitted (see Docket #177).</p> |
| 157 | 09/10/01 | <p>GRANTED / MOOT Motion to Extend Time</p> <p>Regarding opposition to the subject of Docket # 153 above. Note that though it is possible the basis for the opposition has changed in light of the Docket # 153 ruling above (thus rendering the matter entirely moot), the Opposition has already been submitted (see Docket #160).</p> |
| 158 | 09/10/01 | <p>DENIED / MOOT Motion to Extend Time</p> <p>To file reply to opposition to motion for voluntary dismissal, rendered moot by subsequent withdrawal of motion for voluntary dismissal (Docket #171).</p> |
| 159 | 09/14/01 | <p>GRANTED / MOOT Motion to Extend Time</p> <p>For reply to various motions by Plaintiffs, many of which have been rendered moot above; in any event, the reply has subsequently been filed (see Docket # 165).</p> |

- 161 09/18/01 **GRANTED / MOOT Motion to Extend Time**
Regarding certified translations the subject of Docket # 153 above. Note that though it is possible these documents are no longer needed in light of the Docket # 153 ruling above (thus rendering the matter entirely moot), the certified translations have already been submitted (see Docket #177).
- 165 09/25/01 **DENIED w/out Prejudice Motion for Protective Order**
Regarding Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Discovery, which was Denied without prejudice above (Docket #153). Defendants may resubmit if necessary in light of new focus of discovery as a result of Docket #153 ruling above.
- 167 09/27/01 **GRANTED / MOOT Motion to Extend Time**
To submit Second Amended Complaint, which has been subsequently submitted (see Docket #169).
- 170 10/05/01 **DENIED / MOOT Motion to Extend Time**
To reply to Motion for Protective Order which was denied without prejudice above (Docket # 165).
- 171 10/09/01 **GRANTED Motion to Withdraw Notice of Voluntary Dismissal (Docket #138)**
- 173 10/09/01 **GRANTED / MOOT Motion to Extend Time**
Regarding certified translations the subject of Docket # 153 above. Note that though it is possible these documents are no longer needed in light of the Docket # 153 ruling above (thus rendering the matter entirely moot), the certified translations have already been submitted (see Docket #177).
- 174 10/09/01 **DENIED w/out Prejudice Motion for Protective Order**
Regarding Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Discovery, which was Denied without prejudice above (Docket #153). Defendants may resubmit if necessary in light of new focus of discovery as a result of Docket #153 ruling above.
- 175 10/16/01 **DENIED / MOOT Motion for Leave**
To file reply to Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendants' Motion for Protective Order in response to Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Discovery (Docket #153 above), rendered moot by our ruling in Docket #153 above.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 3rd, 2001.



DANIEL R. DOMINGUEZ
U.S. District Judge